A COMPARISON BETWEEN THE OCCURRENCE OF PAUSES, REPETITIONS AND RECASTS UNDER CONDITIONS OF FACE-TO-FACE AND COMPUTER-MEDIATED COMMUNICATION: A PRELIMINARY STUDY

Nese CABAROGLU
Faculty of Education, Cukurova University, Turkey
Email: ncabar@cu.edu.tr

Suleyman BASARAN
Faculty of Education, University of Gaziantep, Turkey
Corresponding Author, Email: basaran@gantep.edu.tr , Tel: (+90) 5065361921

Jon ROBERTS
Institute of Education, University of Reading, UK
Email: jonrr45@googlemail.com

ABSTRACT
This study compares pauses, repetitions and recasts in matched task interactions under face-to-face and computer-mediated conditions. Six first-year English undergraduates at a Turkish University took part in Skype-based voice chat with a native speaker and face-to-face with their instructor. Preliminary quantitative analysis of transcripts showed that there were frequent instances of pauses, repetitions and recasts under both conditions. One-way variance analysis of the data demonstrated that the comparative frequency of pauses, repetitions and recasts did not differ statistically significantly under the two conditions. A semi-structured interview with the participants on perceived causes of such frequent elements suggested social and emotional reasons for hesitation, pauses, recasts and repetitions. These small-scale and preliminary findings suggest that further exploration of these modes of communication is merited, and that social and emotional factors may exert a common influence on the linguistic elements studied under both conditions.

Keywords: Computer-mediated communication, Learning English as a foreign language, Pause, Recast, Repetition, Social and emotional factors

INTRODUCTION

Claimed benefits of computer-mediated communication (CMC)

There is evidence that computer-mediated communication benefits "English as a foreign language" students' communication skills. Dietz-Uhler and Bishop-Clark (2001) affirm positive effects of both synchronous and asynchronous CMC on consecutive face-to-face discussions. Heins et.al. (2007) report improved student participation, better use of the target language and higher degree of tutor control in computer-mediated communication in comparison with face-to-face interaction in language tutorials. Positive effect of CMC in reducing communication apprehension (Arnold, 2007) and improving the quality of language output (Keller-Lally, 2006) has also been reported. CMC literature also indicates positive learning outcomes such as enhanced motivation (Cabaroglu & Roberts, 2007), increased learner autonomy (Schwienhorst, 2003; Kötter, 2003), reflective interaction (Lamy and Goodfellow, 1999), self-paced language instruction (Yang and Chen, 2006; Godwin-Jones, 2007), enhanced student-centeredness and collaboration (Warchauer, 1996) and consciousness of learning objectives (Yamada & Akahori, 2007). Also reported are positive effects for syntactic complexity (Tammelin (2004) and grammatical accuracy (Warchauer, 1996; Shang, 2007) and productive performance (Yamada & Akahori, ibid.). Payne and Whitney's (2002) study indicated that participants in the experimental condition (synchronous computer-mediated communication) scored significantly higher in L2 oral proficiency assessments than the participants in the control condition.

CMC as a distinctive mode of communication

The extent to which CMC communication differs from face-to-face is under debate. Böhlke (2000), describing language produced in chat rooms and face-to-face discussion groups, asserts that the output produced in synchronous computer-mediated communication constitutes "a new type of orality, a hybrid between spoken and written discourse" (p.1) In contrast, Fischer (1992) claims that "basic social patterns are not easily altered by new technologies and that they are resilient even to widespread innovations" (p.260). Fischer (1997) further asserts that effects of technology for community are: "(a) modest; (b) different for different devices, so that one cannot make blanket statements about "technology"; and (c) complex, indirect and even contradictory" (p.113). This is supported by Weisband (1995) who found that status effects persist in both face-to-face and electronic groups and that status labels and impressions have a larger impact on participation and influence than communication mode.

CMC as an opportunity for intercultural contact

In contexts where teachers and learners of English as a foreign language have limited direct access to native speakers and target language and culture, as in many parts of Turkey, CMC can offer authentic opportunities for the acquisition of target language skills and intercultural awareness (Shulman, 2001; Chapelle, 2003; Hamzah, 2004). Egbert (2005:5) asserts that "computer tools, particularly Internet support for computer-mediated communication (CMC), give us different opportunities than afforded by other tools." Meskill, (2005) and Levy (2007) argue that it provides support for effective acquisition.

Pauses, repetitions and recasts

In our preliminary small study we focus on conversational gaps to explore the effects of different interactional conditions. Conversational gaps can be either hesitation pauses, switching pauses or initiative time latencies. Following Kalman, et al. (2006) we define 'hesitation pauses' as within-turn pauses by the speaker and 'switching pauses' as silences followed by turn-taking. Initiative time latencies are the gaps left by a speaker to terminate his turn, and thus allowing the interlocutor to initiate his.

Repetitions are defined as a simple form of recasts, which entail an elaborated grammatical or lexical change (Gass, 2003). Recasts are defined by Gass (2003, p. 239) as "instances in which an interlocutor rephrases an incorrect utterance with a corrected version, while maintaining the integrity of the original meaning." A number of studies have focused on recasts as implicit negative feedback by an interlocutor (e.g. Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Lyster, 1998). On the other hand, Doughty (2003) asserts that especially concentrated simple recasts, in other words 'repetitions', for which learners are developmentally ready, are beneficial to learners. In the present study, we take any repetition of words that involve partial or complete change as a recast. Here, the term "recast" does not mean corrections done by the instructor, but rather, it is taken to mean corrective or allegedly corrective re-wording or, in some instances, paraphrasing strategy used by learners that participated in the communication tasks, despite the fact that the term is commonly used for the correction done by the interlocutor (e.g. Hauser, 2005).

Previous research has focused on pauses, repetitions and recasts as evidence for the learner to enhance either his comprehension or production of linguistic forms. This study takes another perspective. We focus on utilization of these elements by the learner himself/herself, excluding the role of these elements in turn-taking. We take them as possible indicators of fluency, of the emotional and interpersonal barriers a learner has to overcome during face-to-face and computer-mediated communication tasks when communicating with highly fluent and competent native-speaker and non-native speaker interlocutors. We therefore hypothesized that the relative frequency of such elements in computer-mediated and face-to-face communication tasks should improve our understanding of the effects of these conditions on participants' performance, and of the social and emotional dynamics at work. The critical need to improve the training of undergraduate English teachers, which motivates the present study, is shown in the following section.

Context of the study: limited communication skills of English teachers in Turkey

The six undergraduate students in our study were embarking on a four-year teacher training program. In contemporary Turkey, where foreign language teacher training is quite problematic (Demirel, 1999; Toktar; 2000; Özyar, 2003), the employment of sufficient numbers of competent and proficient teachers of English is a critical issue for the Ministry of Education (Üstüner, 2004). Most English teaching vacancies are filled, but application rates are so low that university graduates do not have to compete for employment, and also The Ministry fills some vacancies with non-specialists (see Table 1). Additionally, the professional development of teachers is limited since the Ministry of Education does not have an effective control and inspection system and in-service training programs are scarce and ineffective (Karaata, 2007).

Table 1 English teachers' field of study and the number of teachers graduated from each field

Field of Study	Number
English Language Teaching (Faculty of Education)	7654
British and/or American Literature, Translation, Linguistics, etc.	2788
Other Fields	23526
Total	33968

Source: English and Computer Literacy Report (ÖBBS, 2006), Turkish Ministry of Education.

Furthermore, the Ministry's English and Computer Literacy Report (ÖBBS, 2006) on the self-perceived qualifications and proficiency level of 855 teachers of English working in randomly selected 492 state primary

schools indicates that 36.4 % of those surveyed state that they do not understand what they read in English and 51.7 % accept that they do not understand what they hear in English. Also, 40.6 % of the participants say that they have serious problems in writing and 52.3 % of them believe that they are not proficient enough to speak English (Percentages were taken as the sum of replies for "none" and "very little" in Likert-type scale).

The report does not include an analysis of the relationship between English Teachers' specialization and their perceived level of proficiency and the data in the report do not enable such an analysis. However, the problem seems to be common to teachers of English irrespective of the field of specialization (Işık, 2007). The observation that most students entering universities have a poor command of English indicates that foreign language teaching is not effective in state schools (Okan & Basaran, 2007; Kayaoğlu, 2007). We can speculate that English teaching majors come to University with deficits in their communication skills, and that currently many are not sufficiently improved by university training. This has motivated attempts by the author to enhance communication skill instruction (Cabaroglu and Roberts, forthcoming) and to explore the potential of CMC to do so.

Focus of the present study

Notwithstanding the fact that comparing the effects of the two distinct modes would probably provide certain insights as to whether or not CMC with native speakers of the target language could support face-to-face communication with non-native speakers, this study does not have such an objective. Here, the compared frequency of pauses, repetitions and recasts under the two conditions serves to explore the hypotheses that social patterns are not easily changed under different interactional circumstances and that similar social and emotional processes are at work during oral language production, no matter what the mode is. However, the study also provides data on learners' perceptions about the overall impact of CMC experience and their ideas concerning usefulness of CMC and task design in computer-mediated and face-to-face communication.

Most studies have so far addressed the consequences of computer-mediated communication and not the process itself. Specifically, no research on emotional and interpersonal aspects of CMC and relative fluency evidenced by pauses, repetitions and recasts has been cited in literature. Thus, the purpose of this paper is to investigate whether or not the mode of communication has a direct effect on the frequency of pauses, repetitions and recasts and analyze possible factors that cause frequent occurrence of such elements. To be more precise, the study comprises both quantitative and qualitative analysis of pauses, repetitions and recasts in communication under face-to-face and computer-mediated conditions as two distinct modes. As the two conditions are different but the effects of this difference are under-researched, we chose to explore features we judge to be meaningful in communication: pauses, repetitions and recasts, and participants' perceptions of possible reasons underlying frequent instances of such phenomena.

Preliminary analysis of transcripts showed that pauses, repetitions and recasts were frequent in participants' face-to-face interaction. This finding, as well as some related assertions in the literature (e.g. Fischer, 1992; Weisband, 1995), led us to hypothesize that the communication mode cannot be taken as the decisive factor that affects the content and quality of talk. It also led us to predict that similar physiological and/or cognitive processes must be at work during talk under computer-mediated and face-to-face conditions. Thus the study addressed the following research questions:

1. Does the mode of communication have a distinctive effect on the selected features of interaction?
2. 2a. What reasons do participants perceive for the frequent occurrence of pauses, repetitions and recasts in computer-mediated and face-to-face tasks?
3. 2b. What social and psychological constructs can be inferred to influence communication under computer-mediated and face-to-face conditions?

METHOD

This small-scale exploratory study is based on quantitative and qualitative analysis of transcribed Skype-based interactions between six Turkish university students and a native speaker and face-to-face communication between the same students and their instructor. After coding and quantitative content analysis of transcripts, the students were interviewed about their feelings during the interactions and possible reasons for the frequent instances of pauses, hesitation and recasts. Exclusive attention to the measurable effects of an intervention precludes exploration of the dynamic factors at work in the process and in the classroom setting (House, 2002). Complementing analysis of quantitative data, qualitative analysis can serve as a "unique and valuable source of information that complements and informs theory, research and practice" (Marczyk, DeMatteo & Fesrtinger, 2005). Small-scale exploratory qualitative research does not attempt sample-to-population generalization, and

the non-random and small-scale sampling strategy of the present study only allows us to report some enhanced insights, and to justify a larger-scale, more rigorously designed study.

Participants

Six first-year students at ELT department of a state university in Turkey participated in the study. Three of them (2 female and 1 male; aged 18-19 years old) were top students in the class and they were selected because of their higher performance in the listening and speaking class compared to other students. The other three participants (2 female and 1 male) were perceived by the instructor to be the poorest in listening comprehension and speaking. They all had similar backgrounds concerning the amount and type of language instruction they had earlier received. Therefore, on entry to the program they had a good grammatical knowledge and reading comprehension skill, whereas they were relatively inefficient in aural and oral language learning skills. None had prior experience of CMC-mediated spoken communication

Data collection tools

Data collection tools of the study included transcripts of computer-mediated voice chat and face-to-face talk structured by matched communication tasks and semi-structured interviews (Appendix A) with the participants. Semi-structured face-to-face interviews are powerful tools that serve as a medium to facilitate in-depth analysis of both processes and the themes that emerge during the processes (DeMarrais, 2004), and benefits from flexibility balanced by structure (Gillham, 2005:70). Instances of pauses, repetition and recasts were coded by two raters. Prior to the coding, one of the researchers and the raters met to negotiate and set the coding guidelines. Inter-rater reliability was tested for each of the elements that is, for pauses, repetitions and recasts separately. Pearson correlation was 0.989 for pauses, 0.912 for repetitions and 0.866 for recasts, which show an impressive rate of reliability. Quantitative analysis of the transcripts revealed that there were frequent instances of pauses, repetitions and recasts in both Skype-based voice chat and in face-to-face interaction. This observation led to further scrutiny of possible reasons behind such frequent elements in the data. A semi-structured interview was devised to enable the students to reflect on the data. Content analysis of student feedback helped develop an understanding of the context of and reasons behind highly frequent occurrence of pauses, repetitions and recasts in computer mediated synchronous voice interaction and face-to-face communication.

Tasks and procedures

Both online synchronous talk and face-to-face communication were based on semi-structured tasks set by the native speaker and the instructor and complemented with class work on communication skills and intercultural awareness. The Skype-task required each participant to talk about a teacher who had been influential for them and why. For the face-to-face task, participants were asked to describe an enjoyable event that they experienced when they were at school, saying what the event was, when it happened, what was good about it and explain why they particularly remember it. To acquire comparable data, a two-minute time limit was set for each of the tasks. Participants were briefed about the time limit and the aim of the tasks. They were allowed to go on when the time limit was over, but only the first two-minute part of tasks were transcribed for analysis.

RESULTS

We observed that pauses, repetitions and recasts were remarkably frequent. To compare modes of communication, (research q. 1) one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was carried out for comparative frequencies of pauses, repetitions and recasts. Analysis showed that there was no statistically significant difference between the two interaction types ($p > 0.05$) on frequencies of the three dependent variables. Table 2 shows the statistical values for the effect of interaction type, face-to-face vs. computer-mediated, on dependent variables.

Table 2 The effect of interaction type on pauses, repetitions and recasts

Dependent Variable	Source of variation	Statistical parameters				
		Degree of Freedom	Adjusted sum of square	Mean square	F	p-value
Pauses	Interaction type	1	120	120	1.09	0.320
	Error	10	1101	110.1	-	-
Repetitions	Interaction type	1	16.3	16.3	1.23	0.293
	Error	10	132	13.2	-	-
Recasts	Interaction type	1	10.1	10.1	0.57	0.468
	Error	10	176.8	17.68	-	-

As not only were the interaction modes but also the interlocutors different, the results were highly probable to be different for the two conditions. Finding no difference between the frequency of pauses, repetitions and recasts under CMC and face-to-face conditions can be interpreted to mean that the mode of communication did not have a direct influence on the amount of frequency in this specific context of the study. This leaves us with the prediction that there must be other dynamics at work which can be explored by interview.

As mentioned earlier, the most striking feature to be observed in the transcripts of the communication tasks was the frequent use of pauses, repetitions and recasts as in the following extracts:

1. *"And he was erm…so…erm…I could depend on…erm I could trust his information"*
2. *"they say that…our…my friends said you couldn't do mathematic, you can…erm you can't achieve"*
3. *"When I became a teacher I will erm…I will teach my students like our teacher"*
4. *"because in her lessons erm…you were…you are not boring"*

Any repetition of words that involved partial or complete change as in the second extract (our…my friends) was taken as a recast. Although most of recasts in the data were corrective, the term "recast" does not mean corrections done by the native speaker or the instructor. Rather, it was taken here to mean corrective or allegedly corrective re-wording or, in some instances, paraphrasing strategy used by learners that participated in the communication tasks, notwithstanding the fact that the term is commonly used for the correction done by the interlocutor (e.g. Hauser, 2005).

As is observed in the data and illustrated in the extracts above, pauses were usually preceded and/or followed by repetitions or recasts. A characteristic common to all pauses, repetitions and recasts was that they entailed hesitation, which participants commonly attributed to anxiety and apprehension. This was quite understandable for the face-to-face condition, where learners reported to have felt nervous as if being examined by their instructor. Concerning the face-to-face communication with the instructor one participant said:

> "*Az önce söylediğimiz şeye gelecek, ama sınıf ortamı ile buradaki ortam farklı. Çünkü burada birebir görüştük. Sınıfta atmosfer daha farklı. Hem sesiniz kaydediliyor, bunu biliyorsunuz. Belki gizli bir şekilde yapılsaydı, etik olmaz belki ama, farklı olabilirdi. Hem birebir konuşma, hem ses kaydının olması belki bir tedirginlik oluşturmuş olabilir."*
> ("*As I said earlier, the classroom atmosphere and the atmosphere here are different. As here [on this occasion] we talked one-to-one [with the instructor]. The atmosphere in the classroom is rather different. Moreover, your voice is recorded, you know this. If it [the recording] was done secretly, though it may not be ethical, it [the talk] could have been different. Both the one-to-one talk and the recording may have caused anxiety.")*

The observation that pauses, repetitions and recasts were also frequent in the computer-mediated condition seemed to have plausible implications for the idea that similar social constructs and psychological processes are likely to be at work during oral language production. Although all participants reported to have benefited from CMC experience, factors such as age and status seem to have incited some sort of apprehension at least at earlier stages. One participant said that he was very nervous during the CMC occasion and that his nervousness gradually vanished. When asked about possible reasons for his nervousness, he admitted that talking to a native speaker in his 60s made him nervous. Another participant reported that she was not nervous before she learned that the native speaker she was talking to was an author. Table 3 presents a brief summary of participants' perceptions about their feelings during the tasks under both conditions and possible reasons behind frequent pauses, repetitions and recasts.

Table 3 Participants' Feelings during the Tasks and Possible Reasons for Pauses, Repetitions and Recasts

Participants	Computer-Mediated Communication	Face-to-Face Communication
P1	nervous; poor-self confidence, culture	uncomfortable; recording, unnatural atmosphere
P2	restricted; time limit, thinking what to say	uneasy; difficult task
P3	nervous; native speaker (status), trying not to make mistakes	nervous; instructor (status), trying not to make mistakes
P4	nervous; learning that the native speaker is an author (status), theme (culture)	uneasy; instructor (status), task type,
P5	anxious; native speaker (status), new experience, age	relaxed; lack of practice
P6	nervous; native speaker (status), age, trying not to make mistakes	uneasy; instructor (status), poor command of English

Apparently, theme of the tasks, cultural issues and poor-self-confidence were among other factors that affected the spoken output in CMC. As for face-to-face communication, recording students' voice, talking to the instructor one-to-one –as if taking an exam– and the task type seem to have negative consequences for the face-to-face condition. Despite the fact that all learners claimed to have felt either nervous, uncomfortable or inhibited during CMC, they also said that they enjoyed the experience and that they thought CMC is a beneficial tool for improving their proficiency in speaking English. Participants also stated that their apprehension gradually vanished in subsequent CMC tasks as they got more acquainted with the native speaker.

Although the interviewer explained to the participants that the pauses, repetitions and recasts being studied could not be taken as mistakes and that he was interested in what they felt during the CMC and face-to-face interactions, they could not entirely overcome the sense that they were being questioned about mistakes. It is possible that "impression management" (the desire to present a positive face to the interviewee) led them to say that they were nervous or uncomfortable during the communication tasks under both conditions. Prompts during the interviews helped four participants to reveal that issues such as lack of practice, thinking about what to say and how to say it and trying not to make mistakes were the main reasons behind the high frequency of pauses, repetitions and recasts.

DISCUSSION

Quantitative analysis of communication task content exhibited no statistically significant difference between the frequency of pauses, repetitions and recasts in CMC and face-to-face communication. However, this finding does not mean that both communication modes are one and the same thing and that CMC has negative effects on the quality of oral production. Qualitative data suggest that in certain circumstances apprehension may prevail and that this may have had a negative impact on learner interactions with the native speaker, especially factors such as status and age. This supports the idea that computer-mediated communication can be taken as "an organic extension of traditional human communication, influenced by the constraints of technology, but ultimately shaped by human nature" (Kalman et al., 2006). Our findings also confirm Yang and Chen (2006) that there is a need for careful guidance and awareness and that new technology demands additional learning strategies. One of important implications of the study is that theme selection, planning and preparation are crucial in CMC tasks especially at earlier stages. Teachers' role in facilitating students' planning and preparation for the tasks is very important when the theme or subject of the task is related to cultural issues.

The frequency of pauses, repetitions and recasts in interactions under both conditions and the fact that participants reported to have searched for the right words and structures and tried not to make mistakes during the tasks suggest the relevance of procedural memory issues. In mother tongue, we use procedural memory automatically. We sometimes search for the right words, but we do not think about the rules or structures of the language. If students frequently pause, repeat and/or change the words they use during verbal interactions, this shows either that their knowledge of the target language has not become procedural or that they have been taught only the rules of the target language without sufficient practice opportunities (as is the case in most state schools in Turkey). Procedural memory is acquired through repeated realization of tasks (Schumann, et al., 2004). However, productive skills are related to working memory, which requires temporary storage of information that is being processed (Richardson, 1996) because of processing capacity constraints. Repetitions and rehearsals do not help declarative knowledge become procedural but help learners build and strengthen connections between declarative and non-declarative memory. Conversion of declarative knowledge into procedural knowledge during, say, oral production leads to a too-heavy cognitive load to be processed and hence the frequent occurrence of pauses, repetitions and recasts.

Finding no statistically significant difference between computer-mediated mode and face-to-face mode of communication seems to bear positive implications for the use of CMC in language acquisition. To put it more clearly, CMC can well be used to improve communicative skills of ELT students, which is one of the most important aspects of training proficient and efficient teachers of English in Turkey.

Limitations and future research

This study presents a small-scale exploratory analysis of pauses, repetitions and recasts in six students' talk under CMC and face-to-face conditions and a basis for further exploration. To find out whether or not the mode of communication had a distinctive effect on the frequency of elements students' oral production during CMC with a native speaker was compared with different interlocutors. Obviously this is a major limitation of the present study. Future research should look for an enhanced methodology and analyze the interaction with the same interlocutor under CMC and face-to-face conditions. A two-minute time limit was set for the completion of leach communication task so as to obtain comparable data and each participant was told about the time limit at the beginning of the task, something they claimed as restrictive, an important weakness in the study. In future research, the time limit should not be made known to the participants if time itself is not one of the variables. Another probable weakness of the study is the fact that it focused on data obtained in one of the earliest CMC tasks and that the interviews with the participants were conducted after the completion of some other communication tasks with the native speaker under computer-mediated and with the instructor under face-to-face conditions. Future research should explore the effects of different conditions over a longer period of time. Future studies that comprise content analysis of CMC should also look for more natural observation and data collection tools in order to eliminate their effect on the content. Moreover, the effect of cultural differences and learners' perception of the target culture on the affective and cognitive processes in CMC needs to be further investigated in the future.

CONCLUSION

In this study we analyzed synchronous oral CMC between six Turkish university students and a native speaker and face-to-face communication between the same students and their instructor, based on pre-structured tasks. One-way variance analysis of comparative frequency of pauses, repetitions and recasts showed that the difference was not statistically significant. Interviewees reported that factors such as relative status and age of the interlocutor, culture, task type, theme of the tasks and the time limit set for the tasks had negative effects on CMC experience and that they inhibited the potential benefits of computer-mediated communication mode in the short run. Participants' reports concerning their effort to find the right words and/or structures so as not to make mistakes and the need for more practice provided another possible answer as to what caused frequent occurrence of elements that reduced quality of CMC and face-to-face talk during pre-structured tasks.

REFERENCES

Allwright, D. (1988). Observation in the Language Classroom. New York: Longman Inc.

Arnold, N. (2007). Reducing foreign language communication apprehension with computer mediated communication: A preliminary study. *System*, 35, 469-486.

Böhlke, O. E. (2000). A comparative discourse analysis of output produced by learners of German in a chat room and face-to-face discussion group, and its potential implications for foreign language instruction. Doctoral Dissertation, Michigan State University. UMI: 9971895.

Cabaroglu, N. & Roberts, J. (2007). 'Turkiye calling!': Structured and independent language learning activities enabled by Skype-based exchanges with a native speaker: focus on student motivation. BAAL/Cambridge University Press Seminar Spoken Online Learning Events. http://stadium.open.ac.uk/stadia/preview.php?whichevent=1012&s=29&schedule=1161

Candlin, C. N. (1988). Preface. In D. Allwright, Observation in the Language Classroom. New York: Longman Inc.

Chapelle C. (2003). English Language Learning and Technology, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Crowell, S. E. (2004:101). The Neurobiology of Declarative Memory. In Schumann, J. H. et al. (2004). The Neurobiology of Learning: Perspectives from Second Language Acquisition. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers: London.

deMarrais, K. (2004). Qualitative interview studies: Learning through experience. In deMarrais, K. & Lapan, S. D. (Eds.). Foundations for Research: Methods of Inquiry in Education and Social Sciences. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers, London.

Demirel, Ö. (1999). Yabancı Dil Öğretimi. İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Yayınları.

Dietz-Uhler, B. & Bishop-Clark, C. (2001). The use of computer-mediated communication to enhance subsequent face-to-face discussions. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 17, 269-283.

Doughty, C. (2003). Instructed SLA: constraints, compensation and enhancement. In C. Doughty & M. Long (Eds.), *The Handbook of Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 256-310). Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers.
Fischer, C. S. (1992). America Calling, A Social History of the Telephone to 1940. Berkeley: University of California Pres.
Fischer, C. S. (1997). Technology and community: historical complexities. *Sociological Inquiry*, 67, 113-18.
Gass, S. M. (2003). Input and Interaction. In C. Doughty & M. Long (Eds.), *The Handbook of Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 224-255). Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers.
Gillham, B. (2005). Research Interviewing: The Range of Techniques. Berkshire: Open University Press.
Gilmore, A. (2007). Authentic materials and authenticity in foreign language learning. *Language Teaching*, 40, 97-118.
Godwin-Jones, R. (2007). Emerging technologies tools and trends in self-paced language instruction. *Language Learning & Technology*, 11(2), 10-17.
Hamzah, M. (2004). Facilitating second language acquisition (SLA) in a computer-mediated communication (CMC) learning environment. *Internet Journal of e-Language Learning & Teaching*, 1 (1), 15-30.
Hauser, E. (2005). Coding 'Corrective Recasts': The maintenance of meaning and more fundamental problems. *Applied Linguistics*, 26 (3), 293-316.
Hayes, R. (2005). Designing for dialogue in place of teacher talk and student silence. *Culture & Psychology,* 11(3), 339-357.
Heins, B., Duensing, A, Stickler, U. & Batstone, C. (2007). Spoken interaction in online and face-to-face language tutorials. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/title~content=t716100697~db=all~tab=issueslist~branches=20 - v2020(3), 279 – 295.
House, S. (2002). Who is in this classroom with me? In Johnson, K. E. & Golombek, P. R. (Eds.). Teachers' Narrative Inquiry as Professional Development. Cambridge University Press.
Hu, Y. (2004). Friendship through IM: Examining the relationship between instant messaging and intimacy. *Journal of Computer Mediated Communication,* 10(1).
Işık, A. (2007). Türkiye'deki yabancı dil eğitim sistemine eleştirel bir bakış. Türkiye'de Yabancı Dil Eğitimi Ulusal Kongresi. Gazi Üniversitesi Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi, Ankara.
Johnson, E. (1998). Electronic Discourse. Lulea University of Technlogy. Retrieved January, 25, 2008 from http://www.ludd.luth.se/~jonsson/D-essay/ElectronicDiscourse.html
Kalman, Y. M., Ravid, G., Raban, D. R., and Rafaeli, S. (2006). Pauses and response latencies: A chronemic analysis of asynchronous CMC. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 12 (1), article 1. http://jcmc.indiana.edu/vol12/issue1/kalman.html
Karaata, C. (2007). Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı okullarında çalışan İngilizce Öğretmenlerinin hizmet içi eğitimleri için öneriler. Türkiye'de Yabancı Dil Eğitimi Ulusal Kongresi. Gazi Üniversitesi Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi, Ankara.
Kayaoğlu, M. N. (2007). Zorunlu İngilizce hazırlık programları neden başarılı değil?. Türkiye'de Yabancı Dil Eğitimi Ulusal Kongresi. Gazi Üniversitesi Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi, Ankara.
Keller-Lally, A. M. (2006). Effect of task type and group size on foreign language learner output in synchronous computer mediated communication. Doctoral Dissertation, The University of Texas at Austin. UMI: 3226972.
Kötter, M. (2003). Negotiation of meaning and codeswitching in online tandems. *Language Learning & Technology*, 7(2), 145-172. Retrieved 23.01.2008, from http://llt.msu.edu/vol7num2/kotter/
Lamy, M-N., & Goodfellow, R. (1999). "Reflective conversation" in the virtual language classroom." *Language Learning & Technology*, 2(2), 43-61. Retrieved 23.01.2008 from http://polyglot.cal.msu.edu/llt/vol2num2/article2/index.html.
Lee, N. (2004:49). The Neurobiology of Procedural Memory. In Schumann, J. H. et al. (2004). The Neurobiology of Learning: Perspectives from Second Language Acquisition. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers: London.
Levy, M. (2007). Culture, culture learning and new technologies: Towards a pedagogical perspective. *Language Learning & Technology*, 11(2), 104-127.
Lyster, R. 1998: Recasts, repetition, and ambiguity in L2 classroom discourse. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 20, 51–81.
Lyster, R. and Ranta, L. 1997: Corrective feedback and learner uptake: negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 20, 37–66.
Marczyk, G., DeMatteo, D. & Fesrtinger, D. (2005). Essentials of Research Design and Methodology. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
MEB. (2006). ÖBBS–2004 İngilizce ve Bilgisayar Okuryazarlığı Raporu. Milli Eğitim Basımevi: Ankara.

Meskill, C. (2005). Metaphors that shape and guide CALL research. In Egbert, J.L. (ed.) Call Research Perspectives. Mahwah, NJ, USA: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 25-39.
Okan, Z. & Basaran, S. (2007). Türkiye'nin İngilizce öğretmeni yetiştirme politikası, Türkiye'de Yabancı Dil Eğitimi Ulusal Kongresi. Gazi Üniversitesi Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi, Ankara.
Özyar, A. (2003). Hizmet Öncesi ve Hizmet İçi Öğretmen Yetiştirme. Öğretmen Yetiştirme ve İstihdamı Sempozyumu. Eğitim-Sen Yayınları.
Payne, J.S. & Whitney, P.J. (2002). Developing L2 oral proficiency through synchronous CMC: Output, working memory, and interlanguage development, *CALICO Journal,* 20(1), pp. 7–32.
Preissle, J. & Grant L. (2004). Fieldwork traditions: ethnography and participant observation. In deMarrais, K. & Lapan, S. D. (Eds.). Foundations for Research: Methods of Inquiry in Education and Social Sciences. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers, London.
Richardson, J. T. E. (1996). Evolving Concepts of Working Memory. In Richardson, J. T. E. (Ed.) Working Memory and Human Cognition. Cary, NC, USA: Oxford University Press.
Schumann, J. H. et al. (2004). The Neurobiology of Learning: Perspectives from Second Language Acquisition. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers: London.
Schwienhorst, K. (2003). Learner Autonomy and Tandem Learning: Putting Principles Into Practice in Synchronous and Asynchronous Telecommunications Environments. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/title~content=t716100697~db=all~tab=issueslist~branches=16 - v1616 (5), 427 – 443.
Shang, H. (2007). An exploratory study of e-mail application on FL writing performance. Computer Assisted Language Learning, http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/title~content=t716100697~db=all~tab=issueslist~branches=20 - v2020(1), 79 – 96.
Shulman, M. (2001). Developing Global Connections through Computer-Mediated Communication. *The Internet TESL Journal*, VII (6), 2001. Retrieved January 24, 2008, from http://iteslj.org/Articles/Shulman-CMC.html
Takatalo, J., Nyman, G. & Laaksonen, L. (2008). Components of human experience in virtual environments. *Computers in Human Behaviour*, 24, 1-15.
Tammelin, M. (2004). Introducing a collaborative network-based learning environment into foreign language and business communication teaching. University of Helsinki, Media Education Center.
Toktar, E. (2000). Açık Öğretimde İngilizce Öğretmeni Yetiştirilecek. Cumhuriyet Gazetesi. (16.05.2000).
Üstüner, M. (2004). Geçmişten Günümüze Türk Eğitim Sisteminde Öğretmen Yetiştirme ve Günümüz Sorunları. *İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*. 5 (7).
Warschauer, M. (1996). Comparing face-to-face and electronic communication in the second language classroom. *CALICO Journal*, 13, 7-26.
Weinel, M. & Hu, C. (2007). Social presence and student perceptions in the blend of synchronous and asynchronous communication forms. Seventh IEEE International Conference on Advanced Learning Technologies (ICALT 2007).
Weisband, S. P. (1995). Computer-Mediated Communication and Social Information: Status Salience and Status Differences. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(4), 1124-1151.
Yamada, Masanori & Akahori, Kanji (2007). Social presence in synchronous CMC-based language learning: How does it affect the productive performance and consciousness of learning objectives? *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 20 (1), 37-65. Retrieved January 24, 2008, from http://www.informaworld.com/10.1080/09588220601118503
Yang, S.C. & Chen, Y. (2007). Technology-enhanced language learning: A case study. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 23, 860-879.

Appendix: Semi-structured interview guidelines (translated from the original Turkish version)

We are conducting a study about the Skype-based voice chat with Mr.…. and face-to-face talk with Mrs. …. you accomplished earlier. Our aim is to find out about your feelings during the computer-mediated and face-to-face interactions and possible reasons behind frequent pauses, repetitions and recasts in your talk under both conditions. This is not a study that investigates your mistakes and we do not take pauses, repetitions and recasts as mistakes. We would, also, like to learn about your beliefs and perceptions about the use of computer-mediated and face-to-face communication tasks for language learning.

A. Chat Mode and Anxiety:

1. Do you usually chat? (Frequency, anxiety, with whom…?)
2. Which one would you prefer? Video chat or audio chat? Why? (Anxiety?)
3. Which one is better for improving your English? Face-to-face talk or chat on Skype? Why? Do you think there is a difference between the two? (Feelings? similarities between the two modes?)
4. Do you find text-based online chat easier? (Feelings during text-based synchronous communication?)

B. CMC with Native Speaker and Face-to-Face Communication with the Instructor

5. How did you feel during the chat with Mr. …? (Excited? why?)
6. Were you able to express your thoughts and feelings easily while chatting with Mr. …? (Why? why not?)
7. Were you able to express your thoughts and feelings easily while talking to Mrs. …? (Why? why not?)
8. Which one was more relaxing and enjoyable for you? Skype chat or face-to-face talk? (Why?)
9. Which one made you pay more attention to grammatical structures? Skype chat or face-to-face talk? (Why?)

C. Content: Pauses, Repetitions and Recasts

10. (Showing the transcripts) During the Skype chat with Mr. … you sometimes hesitated, paused and repeated or changed your words? Do you remember your feelings during the chat? (Reasons?)
11. (Showing the transcripts) You sometimes hesitated, paused and repeated or changed your words during the face-to-face talk with Mrs. … as well? Do you remember your feelings during the conversation? (Reasons?)
12. Anything you would like to add?